



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,665	12/17/2003	Dong Jae You	8734.275.00 US	5343

30827 7590 04/06/2007
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

VU, PHU

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2871

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/06/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/736,665

Applicant(s)

YOU ET AL.

Examiner

Phu Vu

Art Unit

2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/6/07
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 and 8-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3, 5-6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated Landmeier 5274198.

Regarding claim 1, Oh teaches a liquid crystal display device, comprising: a liquid crystal display device module (see fig. 5 element 54); and a printed circuit board (32) located in close proximity to a support main (56) of the liquid crystal display device module and a fixing device (28) for inserting a digitizer (30), wherein the fixing device has a floor part) adhering to the support main (56) and a covering part that each receive an edge of the digitizer and wherein the digitizer is inserted between the floor part and the covering part.

Regarding claim 3, the reference teaches the fixing device is formed in a thin pocket shape (see fig. 5).

Regarding claim 5, the reference teaches the fixing device is provided between the support main at a rear portion of the liquid crystal device module and the printed circuit board (see fig. 5).

Regarding claim 6, the reference teaches the two fixing device elements forming a U- shape end portion in contact with the PCB (see fig. 5).9

Regarding claim 12, considering the floor part as only the part contacting the support main than the reference shows a rounded surface along the surface of the printed circuit board (see fig. 5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landmeier in view of Fukuchi et. al US Patent 5336535.

Regarding claim 2, Landmeier teaches all the limitations of claim 2 except a fixing device formed of a polyethylene terephthalate film. Fukuchi teaches forming an LCD substrate of polyethylene terephthalate in order to reduce size, thickness and improve impact resistance (see column 1 lines 64-70). Therefore, at the time of the invention it Would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a fixing

Art Unit: 2871

device to use polyethylene terephthalate in order to improve impact resistance and reduce size and thickness.

Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landmeier and Bogomolny US Patent No. 5984294.

Regarding claims 8 and 9, Landmeier teaches all the limitations of claims 8 and 9 except a covering part coated with a different color from the floor part, and the color printed at an edge of the covering part. Bogomolny teaches a color coded cutting surface that uses different colors to easily distinguish between two differently designated surfaces (see column 2 lines 50-55). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use color codes to easily distinguish different parts or surfaces of a device. While Bogomolny does not relate to LCDs the teaching of using colors to distinguish different surfaces applies regardless.

Claim 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landmeier 661399.

Regarding claim 10, Oh teaches all the limitations of claim 10 except the floor part and covering part being integral. However the MPEP 2144.04 Section V-B states one piece construction instead of the structure discloses in [the prior art] would be merely a matter of obvious engineering choice." Therefore making the floor and covering parts integral is considered obvious.

Regarding claim 11, Landmiere discloses a PCB 32 contacting the digitizer however Landiere also discloses that the substrate 32 could also be eliminated (see column 4 lines 30-35) to reduce thickness thus the covering part would prevent contact

Art Unit: 2871

from any PCB containing digitizing logic and display logic from the digitizer panel.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the covering part to prevent contact from any PCB containing digitizing logic and display logic from the digitizer panel to reduce thickness.

Claims 4 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landmeier in view Kawaguchi et. al. US Patent No. 5670994.

Regarding claims 4 and 13, Landmeier teaches all the limitations of claims 4 and 13, except use of a double-faced tape to adhere a floor part of fixing device at a rear pad of the support main. Kawaguchi teaches use of a double sided tape to bond two surface such that there is an integral attachment (see column 26 lines 20-25). Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to use a double-sided tape to connect the rear part of the support main to the floor part of the fixing device to an integral or secure attachment.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2871

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Nelms can be reached on (571)-272-1787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Phu Vu
Examiner
AU 2871


ANDREW SCHECHTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER